

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/814,375 03/30/2004		Valery M. Dubin	110348-135102	5497		
31817	7590 08/22/2006		EXAMINER			
	E, WILLIAMSON & V	CRANE, SARA W				
PACWEST (CENTER, SUITE 1900 IFTH AVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	O, OR 97204		2811			
			DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application I	No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			10/814,375		DUBIN, VALERY	M.				
			Examiner		Art Unit					
			Sara W. Cran		2811					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).										
Status										
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>05 Jun</i>	ne 2006.							
·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.									
3) 🗀	Since this application is in condition	for allowanc	e except for	formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is				
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Dispositi	on of Claims									
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.										
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
5) 🗌	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.									
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.									
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.									
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or e	election requ	irement.						
Applicati	on Papers									
9)	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.								
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.										
,—	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).										
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.										
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119									
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:										
/-	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.									
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No									
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage									
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).										
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.										
Attachment(s)										
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date										
3) 🔀 Infon	re of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (i mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o r No(s)/Mail Date <u>Nov</u> I く ₁ ンのつЧ	5) 6)	Notice of Informal P		O-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/814,375

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the "metal solution" is not clear. Examiner assumes this is a solution containing metal ions, as in claims 2 or 10 before these claims were amended. But, literally, a metal solution could mean a solution in a liquid metal, for example mercury, which is presumably not what the claim intends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao et al.

With respect to claim 1, column 4, lines 17-29, of the reference teaches a metal plating solution having carbon nanotubes, which is used to form a metal layer on the nanotubes, as shown in for example figure 1. With respect to claim 2, the nanotubes are suspended in the solution, because they are added to the solution and they don't dissolve. With respect to claim 3, the known types of carbon nanotubes would have

Art Unit: 2811

been obvious in view of the listings of column 4, lines 30-41. With respect to claim 4, control of pH, noted at column 4, lines 50-51, would involve some sort of electrolyte. With respect to claim 5, reducing agents are noted at the bottom of column 4. With respect to claims 6-9, known reducing and complexing agents would have been obvious to obtain known advantages. With respect to claim 10, copper, for example, is listed in column 4, line 57. With respect to claim 11, water is noted at column 4, line 53. With respect to claim 12-14, the known plating methods would have been obvious as variants of electroless plating as taught, and in addition to deposit the nanotubes on a substrate as in figure 1. A short anneal would have been obvious to obtain good contact with the substrate, and to evaporate undesirable solvent. Spin-on would have been obvious in view of the listing of application methods at column 6, lines 13- 26, because this method is well-known in the art to give thin uniform layers. A passivation layer would have been obvious to protect from oxidation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Crane, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1652.

The supervisor for Art Unit 2811, Eddie Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2811

Sara W. Crane
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2811